

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8-11 are pending. Claims 1 and 10 are the only independent claims.

Claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,335,361 (Ghaem). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ghaem in view of U.S. Patent 5,726,786 (Heflinger). Claims 8, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Ghaem in view of Heflinger and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,304,357 (Ohhata et al.). Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 10 are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to an optical data bus communication system of an artificial satellite. The system comprises: a plurality of first devices, each of which is equipped with an optical transmitter each transmitter transmitting signals of a differing wavelength; a reflection means that is provided on the entire inner surface of, or at prescribed locations inside, the case of the artificial satellite; and a plurality of second devices, each of which is equipped with an optical receiver that receives optical signals that are transmitted from the optical transmitters both directly and after reflection and diffusing by the reflection means, each receiver receiving optical signals of a different wavelength and reproducing the optical signals from these received signals.

A feature of claim 1 neither taught or suggested in the cited art is the feature by which *each* transmitter transmits signals of a *different* wavelength, and each receiver receives optical signals of a different wavelength. In the final Office Action, the position was taken that Ghaem shows all these features. This is incorrect.

Ghaem is directed to an integrated circuit module that permits devices in the module to communicate with one another by means of electromagnetic waves. In Ghaem,

each chip includes a receiver and a transmitter. The shape of the interior of the housing, combined with a reflective inner surface, allows direct path point to point communication from a transmitter on one integrated circuit to a receiver on another integrated circuit. Dedicated point to point, or point to multipoint transmitters are so arranged on various ones of the integrated circuits. See col. 3, lines 13 through 36. In addition, a broadcast transmitter 147 is aligned so that its signal will be reflected to each receiver, for broadcasting, for example clock information.

The Examiner, in the Final Office Action relies upon portions of Ghaem as allegedly teaching the claimed features. Applicants disagree with the position taken in the Final Office Action.

First, Ghaem's system has point to point communication pairs, such as for communication between the processor 115 and the IC 107. It also has infrared broadcast capability, by infrared from transmitter 147. Transmitter 147 has no counterpart, but rather is global in that all receivers can receive the signal it broadcasts.

At col. 4, lines 39 to 52, the use of non-infrared signals in addition to infrared signals is shown, these extra signals being provided so as to avoid interference with the infrared signals. These non-infrared signals "can communicate with each other without interference from or to the infrared transceivers in the module." Col. 4, lines 48-50. It is clear from this portion of Ghaem that plural transceivers are using infrared, which is not an optical signal at all, while one pair uses a red light wave. Thus, contrary to the position taken in the Final Office Action, this portion of Ghaem in no way teaches that *each* receiver receives *optical* signals of a *different* wavelength. Instead, Ghaem shows that most, or at least a plurality of, transceivers are using infrared (i.e., *non-optical*, and *not different* from one another) while one pair uses red light.

As can be seen from the foregoing, even in the portion of Ghaem referred to in the Final Office Action, there is no teaching or suggestion of the recited feature discussed above. Applicants wish to point out that it is improper to examine the gist of the claimed invention. Each and every word of the claim must be given patentable weight in applying the prior art. In this case, it is quite clear from the foregoing that the recited limitations are not met by Ghaem.

For at least the above reasons, Ghaem does not anticipate the limitations of claim 1. Claim 10 is a corresponding method claim that recites similar features and is believed patentable for similar reasons.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and passage to issuance of the present application.

Dated: July 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By


Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant